# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/195,728 | 11/18/1998 | STEVEN M. DRUCKER | 112375.01. | 4618 |

| 38991 | 7590 | 05/31/2005 |
|---|---|---|

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| YANG, RYAN R |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2672 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 January 2005</u> .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-22,24-39 and 43-46</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-22,24-39 and 43-46</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 October 2002</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>08 October 2002</u> is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1.      A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

1/31/2005 has been entered.

2.      This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 1/31/2005. This

action is non-final.

3.      Claims 1, 3-22, 24-39 and 43-46 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 16, 27,

34, 37, 43 and 45 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 1/31/2005, claim

1 was amended.

4.      The present title of the invention is "View Dependent Tiled Textures" as filed

originally.

### *Drawings*

5.      The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because in Figure 11 "Prior

Art" is not indicated as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is

essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the

drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR

1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the

application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures

appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being

amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as

"amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be

removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must

be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several

views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary

to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after

the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either

"Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are

not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required

corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held

in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

6.      35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

7.      Claims1 and 3-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As per claims 1 and 3-15, the stored data structure is considered non-functional

descriptive material and "When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some

computer-readable medium, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present

to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional

descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make it statutory.

Such a result would exalt form over substance. In re Sarkar, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200

USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978)" (See MPEP 2106 IV.B.1. Nonstatutory Subject Matter).


### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

8.      The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

9.      Claims 16-22, 26-28, 30-31, 33-36, 39, 43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwase et al. (5,616,079).

10.     As per claim 16, Iwase discloses a computer method of applying a texture map to

an image surface in a graphics image rendered on a computer display screen,

comprising:

identifying plural adjacent regions of the image surface to which regions the

texture map is to be applied ("The game space setting means sets the game space by

selecting one of this plurality of map segment patterns on the basis of the position of the

vehicle and the player's line-of-sight direction ...   In this state, if the player's line-of-sight

direction changes so that it is now within the second line-of-sight directional range, the

configuration is such that now the map segment pattern P22 is selected", column 5, line

7-27, where the segmented pattern is adjacent tiles as in Figure 8 and P11 and P21 are

of different views);

determining a user viewing angle for each of the plural regions (P11 and P21 are

of different viewing angles);

correlating each viewing angle with a texture map tile corresponding to the viewing angle ("the configuration is such that now the map segment pattern P22 is selected", column 5, line 26-27); and

displaying the texture map tiles together at the adjacent regions on the computer display screen to form the texture map on the image surface (Since P11 and P21 are a plurality of segmented image presented as an image surface).

As for texture image, since Iwase discloses using an image rendering unit (Figure 19- 516), and as it is well known in the art that an image rendering device is used to render color or shading of an image, it is obvious the image rendered is a texture image.

11.     As per claim 17, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 16, supra, and further discloses the texture map tile corresponding to the viewing angle for each region is one of plural predetermined texture map tiles stored in a computer memory (P11 is a segment pattern previously stored, column 5, line 3-12).

12.     As per claims 18 and 36, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claims 16 and 34, supra, respectively.

As for the texture map tile corresponding to the viewing angle for each region is calculated based upon the determined viewing angle, it is obvious that the texture map tile retrieved should correspond to the viewing angle to have a correct representation of the image.

13.     As per claim 19, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 16, supra, and further discloses determining a viewing angle for each region includes determining only one viewing angle for the region corresponding to angles within only one imaging plane (Figure 7).

14.     As per claim 20, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 19, supra.

As for the one viewing angle is a horizontal viewing angular corresponding to angles within a horizontal imaging plane, since the horizontal angular dimension is a notoriously well known angular dimension, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the dimension in order to view an image.

15.     As per claim 21, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 16, supra.

As for determining a viewing angle for each region includes determining two viewing angles corresponding to angles within two transverse imaging planes, since Iwase discloses the plural respective view could be in one viewing angle, it would have been obvious to extend it to two viewing angle in order to have a wider perspective of the image.

16.     As per claim 22, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 21, supra.

As for the two viewing angles are a horizontal viewing angle and a vertical viewing angle corresponding to angles within horizontal and vertical imaging planes, respectively, since the horizontal and vertical angle are notoriously well known angular

dimension, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use these

dimensions in order to view an image.

17.     As per claims 26, 33 and 39, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to

the rejection of independent claims 16, 27 and 34, supra, respectively.

As for the plural respective views of the image texture are based upon manually

formed renderings of the image texture, since manually formed renderings of the image

texture is notoriously known in the art, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to use it in order to generate a personalized image.

18.     As per claim 27, Iwase discloses a method of generating a tile data structure in a

computer readable medium representing an image texture for a tiled texture mapping,

comprising:

determining plural selected viewing angles for viewing together plural adjacent

tiles of the image texture ("The game space setting means sets the game space by

selecting one of this plurality of map segment patterns on the basis of the position of the

vehicle and the player's line-of-sight direction ...   In this state, if the player's line-of-sight

direction changes so that it is now within the second line-of-sight directional range, the

configuration is such that now the map segment pattern P22 is selected", column 5, line

7-27, where the segmented pattern is adjacent tiles as in Figure 8 and P11 and P21 are

of different viewing angles);

correlating each of the plural selected viewing angles to a predetermined range

of viewing angles that includes the selected viewing angle, immediately successive

predetermined viewing angle ranges being correlated to adjacent tiles of the image

texture ("the configuration is such that now the map segment pattern P22 is selected",

column 5, line 26-27); and

forming for each of the selected viewing angles a data structure that includes

plural projections of the image texture relative to the selected viewing angles of plural

adjacent tiles to be viewed together (Since P11 and P21 are a plurality of segmented

image corresponding to a viewing angle presenting an image surface).

As for texture image, since Iwase discloses using an image rendering unit

(Figure 19- 516), and as it is well known in the art that an image rendering device is

used to render color or shading of an image, it is obvious the image rendered is a

texture image.

19.     As per claim 28, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection

of independent claim 27, supra, and further discloses the image texture includes a front

surface with predetermined dimensions and the projections of the image texture relative

to the selected viewing angles maintains the predetermined dimensions of the front

surface of the image texture (Figure 8 where the image projected on the surface

maintains the same dimension).

20.     As per claim 30, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection

of independent claim 27, supra, and further discloses the plural respective views are

within only one angular dimension ("the map segment pattern shown in FIG. 11 is

selected when the player's fighter is positioned within a shaded range H, and the

player's line-of-sight direction is between -11.25 degrees and 11.25 degrees", column

13, line 35-39).

21.     As per claim 31, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to

the rejection of independent claim 27, supra.

As for the plural respective views are within only two angular dimensions, since

Iwase discloses the plural respective view could be in one dimension, it would have

been obvious to extend it to two dimension in order to have a wider perspective of the

image.

22.     As per claim 34, Iwase discloses in a computer readable medium, computer

software instructions for applying a texture map to an image surface in a graphics image

rendered on a computer display screen (Figure 1 102), comprising:

software instructions for identifying plural adjacent regions of the image surface

to which regions the texture map is to be applied ("The game space setting means sets

the game space by selecting one of this plurality of map segment patterns on the basis

of the position of the vehicle and the player's line-of-sight direction ...  In this state, if the

player's line-of-sight direction changes so that it is now within the second line-of-sight

directional range, the configuration is such that now the map segment pattern P22 is

selected", column 5, line 7-27, where the segmented pattern is adjacent tiles as in

Figure 8 and P11 and P21 are of different views);

software instructions for determining a viewing angle for each of the plural

regions (P11 and P21 are of different viewing angles);

software instructions for correlating each viewing angle with a texture map tile

corresponding to the viewing angle ("the configuration is such that now the map

segment pattern P22 is selected", column 5, line 26-27); and

software instructions for displaying together the texture map tiles corresponding

to the viewing angles at the adjacent regions on the computer display screen to form the

texture map on the image surface (Since P11 and P21 are a plurality of segmented

image presented as an image surface).

23.     As per claim 35, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection

of independent claim 34, supra, and further discloses the texture map tile corresponding

to the viewing angle for each region is one of plural predetermined texture map tiles

stored in a computer memory ("a plurality of map segment patterns are previously

stored to correspond with th positional range", column 5, line 3-5).

24.     As per claim 43, Iwase discloses a computer readable medium, computer

software instructions for applying a texture map to an image surface in a graphics image

for rendering on a computer display screen, the computer software instructions

comprising:

identifying an array of regions of the image surface to which the texture

map is to be applied ("The game space setting means sets the game space by selecting

one of this plurality of map segment patterns on the basis of the position of the vehicle

and the player's line-of-sight direction ...  In this state, if the player's line-of-sight

direction changes so that it is now within the second line-of-sight directional range, the

configuration is such that now the map segment pattern P22 is selected", column 5, line

7-27, where the segmented pattern is adjacent tiles as in Figure 8 and P11 and P21 are

of different views);

determining a projection viewing angle for each region of the array (P11

and P21 are of different viewing angles);

displaying a selected texture map tile at each region on the computer

display screen to form the texture map on the image surface, the selected texture map

tile corresponding to the determined projection viewing angle for the region (Since P11

and P21 are a plurality of segmented image presented as an image surface).

As for texture image, since Iwase discloses using an image rendering unit

(Figure 19- 516), and as it is well known in the art that an image rendering device is

used to render color or shading of an image, it is obvious the image rendered is a

texture image.

25.     As per claim 45, Iwase discloses a computer-readable medium having stored

thereon a tile data structure for a tile representing an image texture for tiled texture

mapping, comprising:

an array of plural tile data structures for displaying on a display screen, the

plural data structures comprising a first tile data structure representing a first projection

view of the image texture based upon a first viewing angle and a second tile data

structure representing a second projection view of the image texture based upon a

second viewing angle, the first viewing angle being different from the second viewing

angle (("The game space setting means sets the game space by selecting one of this

plurality of map segment patterns on the basis of the position of the vehicle and the

player's line-of-sight direction ...  In this state, if the player's line-of-sight direction

changes so that it is now within the second line-of-sight directional range, the

configuration is such that now the map segment pattern P22 is selected", column 5, line

7-27, where the segmented pattern is adjacent tiles as in Figure 8 and P11 and P21 are

of different views).

As for texture image, since Iwase discloses using an image rendering unit

(Figure 19- 516), and as it is well known in the art that an image rendering device is

used to render color or shading of an image, it is obvious the image rendered is a

texture image.

26.     Claims 1, 3-12, 15, 24, 29, 37, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Iwase et al., and further in view of Weisser (5,080,368).

As per claim 1, Iwase et al., hereinafter Iwase, discloses a computer-readable

medium having stored thereon a tile data structure for a tile representing an image

texture for tiled texture mapping, comprising:

plural tile data structures representing plural respective views of the image

texture displayed together on a display screen immediately adjacent each other ("The

game space setting means sets the game space by selecting one of this plurality of map

segment patterns on the basis of the position of the vehicle and the player's line-of-sight

direction ...   In this state, if the player's line-of-sight direction changes so that it is now

within the second line-of-sight directional range, the configuration is such that now the

map segment pattern P22 is selected", column 5, line 7-27, where the segmented

pattern is adjacent tiles as in Figure 8 and P11 and P21 are of different views).

As for texture image, since Iwase discloses using an image rendering unit

(Figure 19- 516), and as it is well known in the art that an image rendering device is

used to render color or shading of an image, it is obvious the image rendered is a

texture image.

Iwase discloses a computer-readable medium to store a tile data structure. It is

noted that Iwase does not explicitly disclose "at least one of the plural respective views

of the image texture being based upon an oblique-parallel projection of the image

texture", however, this is known in the art as taught by Weisser. Weisser discloses in a

computer display in which at least on of the plural respective views is based upon an

oblique-parallel projection of the image tile (Figure 80 and "In the preferred embodiment

of the hypercube, there are 16 vertices, 32 edges, 24 faces, and 8 cells or cubes

represented by oblique parallel projection", column 20, line 49-53).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Weisser into Iwase because Iwase

discloses a storage medium storing tile data structure and Weisser discloses the

adjacent tile data can be shown oblique parallel in order to present a more dynamic

scene.

27.      As per claim 3, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to

the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Iwase further discloses the plural

respective views correspond to a range of user viewing angles that are displayed

together on the display screen, each tile data structure corresponding to a segment in

the range of user viewing angles (Figure 7 where the viewing angle of a segment is

based on a range).

28.    As per claim 4, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of claim 3, supra, and Iwase further discloses the segments in the range of user viewing angles are not equal (Figure 9 where the segments are not equal).

29.    As per claim 5, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of claim 4, supra, and Iwase further discloses viewing angles are with respect to a predetermined reference and the segments closest to the predetermined reference are smaller than the segments farthest from the predetermined reference orientation (Figure 9 shows that for the uneven surface, the segments closer to the view point is smaller than the segments further away).

30.    As per claim 6, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of claim 3, supra, and Iwase further discloses the segments in the range of user viewing angles are equal (Figure 9 shows the segments within the viewing angle and at the same surface are equal).

31.    As per claim 7, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of claim 3, supra, and Iwase further discloses the range of viewing angles extends over viewing angles of positive and negative magnitudes relative to a viewpoint position ("the map segment pattern shown in FIG. 11 is selected when the player's fighter is positioned within a shaded range H, and the player's line-of-sight direction is between -11.25 degrees and 11.25 degrees", column 13, line 35-39).

32.    As per claim 8, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 7, supra.

As for the segments of viewing angles of positive magnitudes to which tile data structures correspond are matched one-to-one with the segments of viewing angles of negative magnitudes to which tile data structures correspond, it is notoriously well known in the art to have the image with a view of positive angle to have an equivalent match of he image with a view of negative angle in order to save memory space.

33.   As per claim 9, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Iwase further discloses the plural respective views are within only one angular dimension ("the map segment pattern shown in FIG. 11 is selected when the player's fighter is positioned within a shaded range H, and the player's line-of-sight direction is between -11.25 degrees and 11.25 degrees", column 13, line 35-39).

34.   As per claim 10, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 9, supra.

As for the one angular dimension is a horizontal angular dimension corresponding to angles within a horizontal imaging plane, since the horizontal angular dimension is a notoriously well known angular dimension, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the dimension in order to view an image.

35.   As per claim 11, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra.

As for the plural respective views are within only two angular dimensions, since Iwase discloses the plural respective view could be in one dimension, it would have

been obvious to extend it to two dimension in order to have a wider perspective of the image.

36.    As per claim 12, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 11, supra.

As for the two angular dimensions are a horizontal angular dimension corresponding to angles within a horizontal imaging plane and a vertical angular dimension corresponding to angles within a vertical imaging plane, since the horizontal and vertical angular dimensions are notoriously well known angular dimensions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use these dimensions in order to view an image.

37.    As per claim 15, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claims 16, 27 and 34, supra, respectively.

As for the plural respective views of the image texture are based upon manually formed renderings of the image texture, since manually formed renderings of the image texture is notoriously known in the art, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use it in order to generate a personalized image.

38.    As per claims 24, 29, 37, 44 and 46, Iwase demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claims 16, 27, 34, 43 and 45, supra, respectively.

Iwase discloses a computer-readable medium to store a tile data structure. It is noted that Iwase does not explicitly disclose "at least one of the plural respective views of the image texture being based upon an oblique-parallel projection of the image texture", however, this is known in the art as taught by Weisser. Weisser discloses in a

computer display in which at least on of the plural respective views is based upon an

oblique-parallel projection of the image tile (Figure 80 and "In the preferred embodiment

of the hypercube, there are 16 vertices, 32 edges, 24 faces, and 8 cells or cubes

represented by oblique parallel projection", column 20, line 49-53).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Weisser into Iwase because Iwase

discloses a storage medium storing tile data structure and Weisser discloses the

adjacent tile data can be shown oblique parallel in order to present a more dynamic

scene.

39.     Claims 25, 32 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Iwase et al. and Weisser as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Cosatto

et al. (5,995,119).

40.     As per claims 25, 32 and 38, Iwase and Weisser demonstrated all elements as

applied in the rejection of independent claims 16, 27 and 34, respectively, supra.

Iwase and Weisser disclose a medium representing an image texture for tiled

texture mapping. It is noted that Iwase and Weisser do not explicitly disclose using

morphing technique to generate projections, however, this is known in the art as taught

by Cosatto et al., hereinafter Cosatto, Cosatto discloses an image generating method in

which morphing art used, column 2, line 50-65.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Cosatto into Iwase and Weisser

because Iwase and Weisser disclose a medium representing an image texture for tiled

texture mapping and Cosatto discloses morphing can be used in order to make

generating in between image possible.

### Response to Arguments

41.    Examiner has called the applicant on 5/5/2005 and 5/9/2005 regarding

requesting interview. Applicant has not returned Examiner's call.

42.    Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but is moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

43.    The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

### Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ryan R Yang whose telephone number is  (571) 272-

7666.  The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (571) 272-7664.  The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Yang
May 15, 2005